

**REMARKS**

In the last Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Tashiro et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0196393, "Tashiro").

By this amendment, Applicants have cancelled claim 2, and amended claim 1 to more appropriately define the invention. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification at, for example, page 6, line 25 to page 7, line 2. See also, Figs. 3a and 3b.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 3, and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Tashiro. In order to properly establish that Tashiro anticipates Applicants' claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102, each and every element of each of the claims in issue must be found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in that single reference. Furthermore, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." See M.P.E.P. § 2131, quoting *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1126, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Tashiro fails to teach each and every element of amended claim 1. In particular, Tashiro does not teach, at least, the claimed "turning over the article to make the second substrate face the predetermined direction," as recited in amended claim 1.

For example, Tashiro discloses in paragraph [0260], and in Figs. 21a and 21b, a curing process of a device including a main seal 6 disposed between a CF substrate 4 and a TFT substrate 16. However, Tashiro's curing of the main seal 6 entails only a ***single irradiation*** of ultraviolet light, with the device structure ***at a fixed position***.

Tashiro's method, therefore, does not teach turning over the device structure, and thus fails to teach the claimed curing method including

“irradiating the article with light entering the article from the first substrate to reach the light curable sealant;

turning over the article to make the second substrate face the predetermined direction; and

irradiating the article with light entering the article from the second substrate to reach the light curable sealant,”

as recited in claim 1.

Since claim 1 is not anticipated by Tashiro, claim 1 is allowable over Tashiro, and claims 3 and 4 are also allowable over Tashiro at least due to their dependence from claim 1.

Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 1, 3, and 4 should be withdrawn.


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: October 2, 2006

By:   
Selah C. Park  
Reg. No. 57,127